

PORTLAND, SATURDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 14, 1880.

POLITICAL RIDERS.

—

The Debate in the House.

—

Four Independent Democrats.

—

The political debate which occurred Thursday, when that clause of the 21st rule was reached which provides that no provision in an appropriation bill shall be in order which changes existing laws, now and then being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall stretch expenditures, was as sharp and excited as the most radical partisan could have desired. It was rendered bitter upon the

George of Simmons to be supervisor of census for Georgia, disagrees with the leader of his party upon several important questions, and is obstinate in his refusal to submit to the party. He announced some time ago that he intended to offer an amendment prohibiting political riders, in defiance of the position occupied by his party, and his remarks in support of it were anticipated with interest. The debate opened Thursday with some heated remarks from Harry White of Pennsylvania and from Mr. Conger in support of an amendment made by Mr. Harris, forming a new party, and in opposition to the party of Mr. White. They went upon the mischievous effects of the rule in enabling the House to annex extraneous matters to appropriation bills, that the President feels obliged to veto, and in so doing defeats the appropriation also, and thus the House dictates

the rest of the government. Mr. Goode of Virginia claimed that it had been a powerful assistance in the attempt made by the Democratic party to

EFFECT RETIREMENT

and reform in the administration of the government. He claimed that it had enabled the Democrats in Congress to effect a saving of \$300,000,000 since their accession to power in the House as well as remove from the statute books obnoxious legislation. Mr. Reed of Maine said he had neglected to name the most important thing conferred by it upon the country, namely, the thorough airing it had given the Democratic party before the country. A proper exhibition of their intentions and methods was enough for the people, who will

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

Obadiah Again.

With Extracts From Jefferson's Writings.

To the Editor of the Press:

This dis-embarrasser of documents of bygone generations who signs his name to his antiquarian broadsides as Obadiah, gives us another shrewdful of Democratic bias of the Supreme Court in the column of the Argus. This time the venerable has been brought on by a veteran and he shows his teeth and utters growl like that of a wolf in a trap—and for the Court he howls that the Supreme Court has put a stop to his howling after what does belong to the brute; and our trap has used the Democratic scheme to seal a Seal. That is the end of the matter with Obadiah.

He wants the President to read Jefferson, and tells us Jefferson wrote the "Declaration of Independence"; thank you! We have heard something of this kind before. If you have a new document, or a new edition of an old one, thought less of another man whose name is

gins with Jefferson you would not be con-
founding the Democratic steal in this State. We
know that the Democratic party have no re-
ctor named he says "governments are ins-
tuted to man men, deriving their just power
from the consent of the governed". Obadiah
said that was the principle of the King of
grand principle and put the power in the Gov-
ernor and Council to issue without question
certificates to whomever they pleased no mat-
ter how many thousands of people they might
—they differed between Obadiah and the Coun-
cil — he told to Jefferson; he doesn't."

Again, here Jefferson arraigns the King of
England as being tyrannical for taking away
commodation of large dissections of people un-
less those people would relinquish the right of
representation in the legislature—a right in-
alienable from them. He said "I don't know
ly."—He said "I do precisely that," and
considering that it is one hundred years since
the king did what Jefferson charged him, I say
that we have a much greater reason for
than George the Third ever drew against us.

Perrin me to quote from an address adopted
October 26, 1774—Journal of Congress, Vol. 1,

page 60. "In this torch the first grand right is that people have a share in their own government by their representatives chosen by themselves and in consequence of being ruled by laws which they themselves approve, not by the edicts of men over whom they have no control. This is a bulwark surrounding and defending their property so that no portion of it can legally be taken from them but with their own full and free consent."

Obadiah wanted the people of this city to have a valuation put upon them for the next ten years, and would compel our people to pay one-eighth of the State tax without having any voice in the matter. He wanted to extend

